

Remarks

Claims 1-12 are now pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4-6 and 11 and present claim 12 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Applicant submits herewith two corrected sheets of drawings including Figs. 3 and 4. In fig. 3, Applicant has reversed the numbering of elements 12 and 13 to conform to the numbering in the specification. In Fig. 4, Applicant has corrected the labeling of the axis of the tilt from "F" to "E" to conform to the description in the specification. The cabling is represented by the broken line labeled 29 in Fig. 4. This is described at page 15, lines 1-10 of the specification. Claim 6 no longer recites that the cabling is radially fixed to the drive shaft. However, the cabling may be fixed by friction, which is not easily illustrated. Applicants submit that the drawings comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

In the preliminary amendments submitted with the application as filed, Applicant deleted references to the claims on page 5 of the specification. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection the specification.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant has amended claim 11 to more clearly set forth the method steps included in the method. Applicant has amended the phrase "part/tilt" throughout the claims to clarify the claimed

structure. Applicant has also amended the claims to clarify the axes being referred to. Applicant submits that claims 1-11 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. patent 5,816,108 to Obata et al.

Obata et al. does not disclose the invention recited in claims 1-11 since, among other things, Obata et al. does not disclose a wrist part forming a tilt pivotably journalled in the wrist housing. The tilt 8 according to the claimed invention is illustrated in Fig. 1. Obata et al. discloses a completely different type of wrist housing. Along these lines, Obata et al. discloses a wrist that does not include a rotating tilt. The wrist disclosed by Obata et al. includes a two wrist portions, none of which is a tilt and none of which is pivotally journalled. The wrist portions only rotate.

Additionally, Obata et al. does not suggest a turn disc that rotates about an axis of rotation perpendicular to the axis of rotation of a tilt. At the most, Obata et al. suggests a tool support portion 5 to which a tool would be attached. The tool support portion does not rotate about an axis perpendicular to an axis of rotation of a tilt or with respect to the axis of rotation of any of the wrist portions. Tool support only rotates about an axis 35 that is at an angle with respect to the angle of rotation of the second wrist part.

Furthermore, Obata et al. does not disclose a first transmission that rotates a tilt and a

second transmission that rotate a turn disc. Clearly, since Obata et al. does not disclose a tilt, Obata et al. does not disclose such a first transmission. Additionally, Obata et al. since all of the wrist parts and tool attachment rotate more or less in line, Obata et al. does not disclose a second transmission that rotates a turn disc about an axis perpendicular to the axis that the first transmission pivots the tilt.

In view of the above, Obata et al. clearly discloses a structure that is quite different than the structure recited in the claims that functions quite differently.

In view of the above, Obata et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-11. Since Obata et al. does not disclose all elements of the invention recited in claims 1-11, the invention recited in claims 1-11 is not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). For an anticipation rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) no difference may exist between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure. *See Scripps Clinic and Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 U.S.P.Q. 841 (C.A.F.C. 1984).

Along these lines, anticipation requires the disclosure, in a cited reference, of each and every recitation, as set forth in the claims. *See Hodosh v. Block Drug Co.*, 229 U.S.P.Q. 182 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986); and *Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commissioner*, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

In view of the above, the reference relied upon in the office action does not disclose

patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the reference relied upon in the office action does not anticipate the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited reference and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection based on the cited reference.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of this application and issuance of the notice of allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant respectfully urges the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 22, 2010

/Eric J. Franklin/
Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
Attorney for Applicant
Venable LLP
575 Seventh Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
Telephone: 202-344-4936
Facsimile: 202-344-8300